

Commercial.

Shipping.

THIS DAY.

Noon.
We have not a single transaction to report from the Share Market this morning. Banks are firmer and are now in request at 182 premium, holders standing out for a higher rate. Luzons are also in better demand, offers to buy at 84 failing to induce holders to come to terms. Other stocks remain as per annexed list.

4 o'clock p.m.

No business has been reported to us since the issue of our noon sheet. Luzons have gone up considerably in value and are now in demand at 86 per share, at which rate holders decline negotiating. Nothing else requires special comment.

SHARES.

Hongkong and Shanghai Bank—cum New Issue

—182 per cent. premium, buyers.

Union Insurance Society of Canton—\$620 per share, sellers.

China Traders' Insurance Company—\$71 per share.

North China Insurance—Tls. 1,350 per share.

Canton Insurance Company, Limited—\$12 per share.

Yangtze Insurance Association—Tls. 1,000 per share, sellers.

Chinese Insurance Company—\$200 per share, buyers.

On Tai Insurance Company, Limited—Tls. 150 per share.

Hongkong Fire Insurance Company—\$360 per share, sellers.

China Fire Insurance Company—\$360 per share, sellers.

Hongkong and Whampoa Dock Company—58 percent. premium.

Hongkong, Canton, and Macao Steamboat Co.—\$49 per share, premium.

China and Manila Steam Ship Company—110 per share.

Hongkong Gas Company—\$80 per share.

Hongkong Hotel Company—\$150 per share, sellers.

Indo-China Steam Navigation Company, Limited—20 per cent. dis.

China Sugar Refining Company, Limited—\$133 per share, sellers.

China Sugar Refining Company (Debentures)—2 per cent. premium.

Luzon Sugar Refining Company, Limited—\$86 per share, buyers.

Hongkong Ice Company—\$150 per share, sellers.

Hongkong and China Bakery Company, Limited—\$80 per share, buyers.

Chinese Imperial Loan of 1878—14 percent. prem. ex-int.

Chinese Imperial Loan of 1881—par.

EXCHANGE.

ON LONDON—Bank, T. T. 3/81

Bank Bills, on demand 3/81

Bank Bills, at 30 days' sight 3/81

Credits, at 4 months' sight 3/9 @ 3/9

Documentary Bills, at 4 months' sight 3/91

ON PARIS—

Bank Bills, on demand 4/70

Credits, at 4 months' sight 4/78

ON BOMBAY—Bank, T.T. 2268

ON CALCUTTA—Bank, T.T. 2268

On Demand 227

ON SHANGHAI—

Bank, sight 72

Private, 30 days' sight 73

OPPIUM MARKET: THIS DAY.

NEW MALWA	per picul, \$535 (Allowance, Taels 92.)
OLD MALWA	per picul, \$575 (Allowance, Taels 86.)
NEW PATNA, high touch (without choice)	per chest \$567
NEW PATNA, high touch (first choice) per chest \$570
NEW PATNA, high touch (bottom) per chest \$572
NEW PATNA, high touch (second choice) per chest \$565
NEW PATNA, low touch (without choice) per chest \$565
NEW PATNA, low touch (first choice) per chest \$567
NEW PATNA, low touch (bottom) per chest \$570
NEW PATNA, low touch (second choice) per chest \$562
OLD PATNA, per chest \$571
NEW BENARAS, high touch (without choice) per chest \$571
NEW BENARAS (bottom) per chest \$565
TURKEY, per picul, \$620 @ \$620	
NEW PERSIAN (best quality) per picul, \$445 @ \$453	
OLD PERSIAN (best quality) per picul, \$375 @ \$405	
OLD PERSIAN (second quality) per picul, \$305 @ \$352	

HONGKONG TEMPERATURE.

(FROM MESSRS. FALCONER & CO'S RECEIPTS, YESTERDAY.)

Barometer—1 P.M. 30° 175

Barometer—P.M. 30° 175

Thermometer—1 P.M. 68° 62

Thermometer—1 P.M. (Wet bulb) 62° 60

Thermometer—4 P.M. 62° 60

Sundries—A.M. 62° 60

Barometer—1 P.M. 30° 154

Thermometer—1 P.M. 62° 60

Thermometer—4 P.M. 62° 60

Thermometer—1 P.M. (Wet bulb) 62° 60

Thermometer—Maximum (over night) 62° 60

SHIPPING IN HONGKONG.

STEAMERS.

CHINA German steamer, 640, F. W. Focke,

9th December—Swatow 5th Dec., General

Yuen Fat Hong.

CITY OF TOKIO American steamer, 3,070, De-

barked 5th Dec.—San Francisco 7th Nov.,

and Yokohama 30th, Mails and General

P. M. S. S. Co.

COPTIC British steamer, 2,788, Kidney, 9th Nov.,

—Shia Fransico 11th October, and Yoko-

hama and November, Mails and General

O. & O. S. S. Co.

DANUBE British steamer, 561, J. Newton, 2nd

November—Bangkok 21st November, Rice

and General—Yuen Fat Hong.

EMY Spanish steamer, 410, Remerencia 10th

June—Manila 27th June, General—Re-

diles & Co.—Kowloon Dock.

FAME British steamer, 117, A. Stoyan—Hong-

kong and Whampoa Dock Co.

GREYHOUND British steamer, 217, D. Scott, 11th

Dec.—Pakho 6th Dec. and Holow, 8th

General—Adamson, Bell & Co.

HAINAN British steamer, 281, J. Wolfe, 28th

Nov.—Holow 26th November, General

Along & Co.

JAPAN British steamer, 1,865, T. S. Gardner,

4th Dec.—Calcutta 7th Nov., Penang 24th

and Singapore 27th, 2,000 chests, Opium

1,560 bales, Cotton, 2,021 bales, Saltpetre,

and 2,000 packages Sundries—Dr. Saksen-

Sohn & Co.

KIANG-FING Chinese steamer, 560, Hollands

C. M. S. N. Co.—Cosmopolitan Dock.

KWANTUNG British steamer, 680, M. Young,

9th Dec.—Fochow 4th Dec., Andy 1st

and Swatow 8th, General—D. Lawrie & Co.

LAUREL American steamer, 1,200, Robert C. Lopez

Vestris, 2nd December—Calcutta 4th April, Coal

& O. & N. Co.—Cosmopolitan Dock.

Wolff German steamer, 4, 1st Dec., Commander

Von Raven, Shanghai.

HONGKONG STEAMERS
Continued.

LENNOX British steamer, 1,327, Scott, 4th Dec., Calcutta 23rd and Singapore 27th, General

—Adamson, Bell & Co.

VOLTA French cruiser, Captain Fournier, 11th

Dec.—Yokohama, and Nagasaki 7th Decem-

ber.

MENMUI British steamer, W. Ellis, 28th Dec., Sydney 10th Nov., Townsville 15th

Cooktown 16th, Thursday Island 22nd, and Port Darwin 26th, General—Gibb, Livingston & Co.

PILOT FISH Spanish steamer, Bernardo Vhi,

27th Nov.—Manila, 24th November, General

—Remedios & Co.—Cosmopolitan Dock.

SELMALLA British steamer, 1,002, Fowler, 16th

November—Newchwang 15th Nov., Beans.

YUNG-CHING Chinese steamer, 761, Andrews,

10th Dec.—Shanghai 6th December, General

—C. M. S. N. Co.

CANTON.

FUNG-SHUN Chinese steamer, 862, E. Tisdall,

11th Dec.—Chinkiang 7th Dec., General

—C. M. S. N. Co.

YUNG-CHING Chinese steamer, 761, Andrews,

10th Dec.—Shanghai 6th December, General

—C. M. S. N. Co.

WHAMPoa.

EREKONIC German bark, 456, A. Nausch, 20th

November—Newchwang 6th Nov., Beans.

Siemens & Co.

JACOBINE German bark, 417, C. H. Christian,

23rd Nov.—Newchwang 15th Nov., Beans.

—Ed. Schellwitz & Co.

RODERICK HAY British bark, 203, Nicholson,

30th Nov.—Newchwang 15th Nov., Beans.

—Captain.

ST. IDEUC French bark, 360, T. Durand, 30th

Nov.—Newchwang 20th Nov., Beans.

Carlowitz & Co.

RIVER STEAMERS.

Hankow, British steamer, 2, 235, J. Ogston.—But-

terfield & Swire.

Ho-nam British steamer, 1,377—Hongkong

Canton, & Macao Steamboat Co.—Laid up.

Kiu-kiang British steamer, 617, T. Benning—

Hongkong, Canton, & Macao Steam-

purchase land or houses, and may erect dwellings, warehouses and factories. The sites for the foreign Settlements are to be selected and laid out by the Corian Government, in conjunction with the competent Foreign Authorities, and will be managed by a Council, the constitution of which will be determined in the same way. British subjects will have full liberty to travel and trade in the interior of the country, and will be amenable in the settlements or elsewhere to such Municipal Police and other Regulations as may be agreed on by the authorities of the two countries.

Article V. gives British subjects the right to import into any Corian open port from any foreign port or any Corian open port, all kinds of merchandise (excepting prohibited goods); and to export the same to any Corian open port, or to any foreign port. It provides for drawbacks on foreign goods, and for the refund of duty on Corian produce when proved to have been conveyed to a Corian open port. All goods that have once paid the duty of the tariff may be transported to any Corian open port free of duty, or may be conveyed into the interior free of any additional tax, excise or transit duty whatsoever. Tonnage dues are to be paid at the rate of 30 cents per ton, a single payment being good for four months; and the whole of the dues so collected are to be appropriated to the construction of lighthouses, beacons, etc., and to the improvement of the anchorages at, and the approaches to the open ports.

Article VI. relates to smuggling at non-opened ports, the penalty being confiscation of the smuggled goods, as well as the forfeiture of twice their value.

Article VII. details the course to be followed in case of shipwreck, or when a British vessel is stranded on the Corian Coasts. All salved cargo or property is to be carefully protected, and the wants of the shipwrecked persons fully provided for.

Article VIII. relates to ships of war. They may visit any Corian port, may store supplies at the open ports, and may make surveys of the Coasts.

Article IX. sanctions the employment of Corian subjects by British subjects in any lawful capacity.

Article X. is the favoured nation clause, and accords to the British Government and subjects all privileges that have been or may hereafter be granted by the Corian Government to the Government or subjects of any other Power.

Article XI. provides for the revision of the treaty and tariff by mutual consent in ten years.

Article XII. provides that any dispute as to the meaning of the treaty shall be determined by the English text.

The Regulations of Trade annexed to the treaty define the course of procedure in relation—firstly, to the entrance and clearance of vessels; secondly, to the landing and shipping of cargo and the payment of duties; and thirdly, to the protection of the revenue.

The Import Tariff in its classified form is arranged under six headings:

Class I.—Duty-free goods—contains agricultural implements, books, bullion, coins, models, packing materials, plants, samples, scientific instruments, travellers' baggage, &c.

Class II., being goods subject to an ad valorem duty of five per cent., comprises various raw materials, together with grain, seeds, beans and pulse, flour and meal, hides and skins, horns and hoofs, kerosene and mineral oils; metals in pig, sheet, bar, &c.; oil cake, and all manures, drugs and medicines; yarns of all kinds; and all unmanufactured articles, raw or unmanufactured.

Class III.—The goods under this head, which are to pay 7½ per cent. ad valorem, form the most important class of the tariff. They consist of cotton, manufactures of all kinds, cotton and woollen, and cotton and silk mixtures; woolen manufactures of all kinds, and woollen and silk mixtures; linen or flax mixed with cotton wool, or silk; glass cloth, and all textiles in hemp, jute, &c.; clothing or wearing apparel of all sorts; ordinary carpeting, chemicals, dyes, colours, and paints; leather; window glass, plain or colored; metals in pipe, tube, or wire; steel, tin-plates, nickel, white copper or other valuable metals; hardware, cutlery, machinery, porcelain, paper, soap, sugar, all qualities; tea; raw silk; and some silk manufactures; soft woods and timber, and all unenumerated articles partly manufactured.

Class IV. comprises goods liable to a duty of ten per cent., and consists of beer and foreign wines, superior carpeting, certain silk manufactures, and clothing made wholly of silk; clocks and watches, in silver; glassware, furniture, leather manufactures, fancy paper, plated ware; pictures, hard woods, various articles of superior make; and all unenumerated articles completely manufactured.

Class V. consists of goods liable to twenty per cent. duty. These are articles of luxury, such as amber, coral, jade, ivory, birds' nests, tortoise shell, embroideries, furs, musk, jewellery, precious stones, velvets, watches either gold or gilt, firearms, tobacco, spirits and liqueurs, &c.

Class VI., being prohibited goods, consists of adulterated goods or medicines, arms and munitions of war (except when imported under permit), counterfeit coins, and opium (except medicinal opium).

All native produce, except the few listed, consisting of refined gold and silver, bullion, gold and silver coins, plants, samples, and travellers' luggage, will pay an ad valorem duty of five per cent. The exportation of red ginseng is prohibited.

The above ad valorem tariff is to be converted into specific rates, as soon as possible by the authorities of the two countries.

Duties may be paid in Mexican dollars, or Japanese silver yen.

THE INEQUALITY OF SENTENCES.

The subjoined admirable letter, which clearly speaks for itself, and which may as easily be applied to the administration of law in this colony, more especially in the minor courts, recently appeared in the Sydney Morning Herald above the *nom de plume*, "Scrutineer."

Inequality in the administration of the laws is a reproach to the civilisation of a country. In this colony it is our boast that British law and British justice are the foundation of our system of jurisprudence, and with this reflection we are too apt to coddle ourselves, while crying evil demand attention and amendment. It is true that the purity and integrity of our judicial tribunals are really unimpeachable, and will probably compare favourably with those of other countries; but purity and integrity, upon the part of Judges does not necessarily exclude inequality in the administration of law. It has long been a matter of observation, as well amongst legal practitioners in the criminal courts as among the public generally, and especially the criminal portion of this community, that the sentences which offenders receive depend, not altogether upon the magnitude of the offence, but very largely upon the particular judges who may happen to try the cases. Thus, if Judge A is the presiding judge, everybody knows that a prisoner who has pleased guilty, or been found guilty by a jury, will not be sentenced to above 12 or 18 months, while it is equally certain that if Mr. Justice B had been presiding, he would have given from three to five years. Now, there are far fewer mitigating than aggravating circumstances in the administration of public justice. So long as the magnitude of offences of

the same class or description varies so much as it does, it is necessary that the power of varying the punishment in proportion should be entrusted to the judges who try them. But it is not necessary that judges should be left without any other guide or limitation than their own inclination. In civil matters many things are left in the discretion of the Judge, but this has never been supposed to mean that the Judge "decides" them arbitrarily according to his inclination. Rules and principles are agreed upon among the judges, or established by precedent, from which no judge would feel at liberty to depart. Indeed, it has been laid down that legal discretion is the exercise of a sound judgment according to rules and principles of law. And if this be so in civil matters, is it not much more important that it should be so in criminal matters? It's thought intolerable that the decision of cases in equity should depend upon the conscience of a Chancellor, which may vary in different Chancellors just as the length of their feet varies, and equity lawyers have repudiated such a change as deteriorating to the character of the Court; but if this be so in respect of pounds, shillings, and pence, or the rights affecting a piece of land, is not the same principle more strongly applicable when the liberty of a man is at stake? The inequality of the sentences given by different judges was evidently considered by the framers of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, and a system of minimum punishments was arrived at as a remedy. It may well be doubted whether anything will be gained in the direction of equality of sentences by this system, while it is certain that there is much disadvantage attending it. The experiment of fixing a minimum punishment has been already tried, for many years in the case of forgery and uttering of bills, &c., for which no less sentence than two years could be imposed. It would be interesting to know how many forgers have served sentences of less than two years for their offences. It was by no means unusual to hear certain judges tell the prisoners that the lowest punishment allowed for this offence was two years' imprisonment, but if at the end of 12 months their conduct in gaol appeared to be satisfactory, a remission would be recommended; in some cases the period has been reduced to six months, and in others to three. The enactment has thus been rendered little better than a sham. Experience has already shown that the same course is pursued with respect to minimum punishments under the Criminal Law Amendment Act; but even if the law were to be carried out strictly, there would still be a latitude so great that the inequality of sentences for crimes of the same magnitude would be practically untouched. For offences punishable with five years' penal servitude, which mean, in effect five years' imprisonment, no less sentence can be given than five, four, or three years respectively, except that in the two latter cases sentences of not less than three or two years' imprisonment respectively may be substituted for penal servitude, and for offences punishable with five years' penal servitude imprisonment for "not less than one year" may be substituted. Now, in looking over the category of offences liable under the Act to one, or other of the punishments above mentioned, it will be evident that there may be, in very many of them, mitigating circumstances which would render even the minimum punishment wholly disproportionate to the criminality or moral turpitude of the case. The Judge must nevertheless pass the sentence, but in doing so he often proclaims it a sham by stating that he will recommend a reduction to the Executive. This is not calculated to inspire respect towards our laws, but rather to exhibit them to the public as harsh and severe, imposing punishment which ought not to be carried out. But even this is not the worst: Juries are led to look upon themselves as protectors of the public against harsh laws. When to this is added the principle that a prisoner is always entitled to the benefit of doubt, and when both these levers are pulled by a powerful advocate for the defence, the probability of a correct verdict may be fairly estimated bearing in mind that one dissentient on the jury will secure the prisoner against conviction. Moreover, if a juror be satisfied that a prisoner's guilt is proved, but sees that the lowest punishment the law allows is greatly in excess of the merits of the case, he is sometimes sadly perplexed, and it may be feared that he too often has regard rather to what appears to him to be the interests of humanity than even to the solemn oath which he has taken, to give a true verdict according to the evidence. A double injury is thus done. Violence is done to the conscience of the persons who break the oaths, and the criminal, with others of his class, is led to hope that the law may, on other occasions also, be broken with impunity.

Maximum punishments are not intended to be inflicted in ordinary cases, because if a case be of the most aggravated character conceivable, no higher punishment can be given. The maximum punishment is, therefore, intended for such aggravated offences as, the minimum punishment for the most mitigation. Any Judge who is fit to occupy the bench is capable of determining whether a case of crime is an ordinary average case, or whether there are aggravating or mitigating circumstances involved in or attending it. It is not upon such questions as these that much difference of opinion would be found among the judges. The true source of the inequality of sentences for offences of the same magnitude is that the judges are not appointed upon the average punishment which should be inflicted for an ordinary average offence of each class, without any special aggravating or mitigating circumstances. To some such class certain judges are in the habit of giving a very much heavier sentence than others do, and it is a logical consequence that the inequality is virtually great where the classes are "aggravated" or "mitigated." Let an average sentence for each class or description of offence be fixed, and the inequality of punishments for offences of the same magnitude would, as far as is practicable under the circumstances, be nothing of the past.

But how can such average sentences be fixed?

There are two ways: by express legislation,

fixing such average sentences, as well as the maximum sentence in each case, or by arrangement among the judges, if they were empowered to meet (either the judges of the Supreme Court alone or the judges of all Courts holding places of judicature), and fix such average punishments by a majority. There would be in either case an authoritative guide which every honest judge would feel himself bound to defer to, and offenders would know that their sentences were not simply arbitrary, but determined by well-known and recognised rules, which all judges, endeavour to apply, alike, and in accordance with the same standard. If a judge, however, should, upon a particular occasion, fix a sentence which the majority of his colleagues would not consider appropriate, the majority would be bound to accept it.

If Mr. Justice B had been presiding, he would have given from three to five years. Now, there are far fewer mitigating than aggravating circumstances in the administration of public justice. So long as the magnitude of offences of

the same class or description varies so much as it does, it is necessary that the power of varying the punishment in proportion should be entrusted to the judges who try them. But it is not necessary that judges should be left without any other guide or limitation than their own inclination. In civil matters many things are left in the discretion of the Judge, but this has never been supposed to mean that the Judge "decides" them arbitrarily according to his inclination. Rules and principles are agreed upon among the judges, or established by precedent, from which no judge would feel at liberty to depart. Indeed, it has been laid down that legal discretion is the exercise of a sound judgment according to rules and principles of law. And if this be so in civil matters, is it not much more important that it should be so in criminal matters? It's thought intolerable that the decision of cases in equity should depend upon the conscience of a Chancellor, which may vary in different Chancellors just as the length of their feet varies, and equity lawyers have repudiated such a change as deteriorating to the character of the Court; but if this be so in respect of pounds, shillings, and pence, or the rights affecting a piece of land, is not the same principle more strongly applicable when the liberty of a man is at stake? The inequality of the sentences given by different judges was evidently considered by the framers of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, and a system of minimum punishments was arrived at as a remedy. It may well be doubted whether anything will be gained in the direction of equality of sentences by this system, while it is certain that there is much disadvantage attending it. The experiment of fixing a minimum punishment has been already tried, for many years in the case of forgery and uttering of bills, &c., for which no less sentence than two years could be imposed. It would be interesting to know how many forgers have served sentences of less than two years for their offences. It was by no means unusual to hear certain judges tell the prisoners that the lowest punishment allowed for this offence was two years' imprisonment, but if at the end of 12 months their conduct in gaol appeared to be satisfactory, a remission would be recommended; in some cases the period has been reduced to six months, and in others to three. The enactment has thus been rendered little better than a sham. Experience has already shown that the same course is pursued with respect to minimum punishments under the Criminal Law Amendment Act; but even if the law were to be carried out strictly, there would still be a latitude so great that the inequality of sentences for crimes of the same magnitude would be practically untouched. For offences punishable with five years' penal servitude, which mean, in effect five years' imprisonment, no less sentence can be given than five, four, or three years respectively, except that in the two latter cases sentences of not less than three or two years' imprisonment respectively may be substituted for penal servitude, and for offences punishable with five years' penal servitude imprisonment for "not less than one year" may be substituted. Now, in looking over the category of offences liable under the Act to one, or other of the punishments above mentioned, it will be evident that there may be, in very many of them, mitigating circumstances which would render even the minimum punishment wholly disproportionate to the criminality or moral turpitude of the case. The Judge must nevertheless pass the sentence, but in doing so he often proclaims it a sham by stating that he will recommend a reduction to the Executive. This is not calculated to inspire respect towards our laws, but rather to exhibit them to the public as harsh and severe, imposing punishment which ought not to be carried out. But even this is not the worst: Juries are led to look upon themselves as protectors of the public against harsh laws. When to this is added the principle that a prisoner is always entitled to the benefit of doubt, and when both these levers are pulled by a powerful advocate for the defence, the probability of a correct verdict may be fairly estimated bearing in mind that one dissentient on the jury will secure the prisoner against conviction. Moreover, if a juror be satisfied that a prisoner's guilt is proved, but sees that the lowest punishment the law allows is greatly in excess of the merits of the case, he is sometimes sadly perplexed, and it may be feared that he too often has regard rather to what appears to him to be the interests of humanity than even to the solemn oath which he has taken, to give a true verdict according to the evidence. A double injury is thus done. Violence is done to the conscience of the persons who break the oaths, and the criminal, with others of his class, is led to hope that the law may, on other occasions also, be broken with impunity.

But how can such average sentences be fixed?

There are two ways: by express legislation,

fixing such average sentences, as well as the maximum sentence in each case, or by arrangement

among the judges, if they were empowered to meet (either the judges of the Supreme Court alone or the judges of all Courts holding places of judicature), and fix such average punishments by a majority. There would be in either case an authoritative guide which every honest judge would feel himself bound to defer to, and offenders would know that their sentences were not simply arbitrary, but determined by well-known and recognised rules, which all judges, endeavour to apply, alike, and in accordance with the same standard. If a judge, however, should, upon a particular occasion, fix a sentence which the majority of his colleagues would not consider appropriate, the majority would be bound to accept it.

If Mr. Justice B had been presiding, he would have given from three to five years. Now, there are far fewer mitigating than aggravating circumstances in the administration of public justice. So long as the magnitude of offences of

the same class or description varies so much as it does, it is necessary that the power of varying the punishment in proportion should be entrusted to the judges who try them. But it is not necessary that judges should be left without any other guide or limitation than their own inclination. In civil matters many things are left in the discretion of the Judge, but this has never been supposed to mean that the Judge "decides" them arbitrarily according to his inclination. Rules and principles are agreed upon among the judges, or established by precedent, from which no judge would feel at liberty to depart. Indeed, it has been laid down that legal discretion is the exercise of a sound judgment according to rules and principles of law. And if this be so in civil matters, is it not much more important that it should be so in criminal matters? It's thought intolerable that the decision of cases in equity should depend upon the conscience of a Chancellor, which may vary in different Chancellors just as the length of their feet varies, and equity lawyers have repudiated such a change as deteriorating to the character of the Court; but if this be so in respect of pounds, shillings, and pence, or the rights affecting a piece of land, is not the same principle more strongly applicable when the liberty of a man is at stake? The inequality of the sentences given by different judges was evidently considered by the framers of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, and a system of minimum punishments was arrived at as a remedy. It may well be doubted whether anything will be gained in the direction of equality of sentences by this system, while it is certain that there is much disadvantage attending it. The experiment of fixing a minimum punishment has been already tried, for many years in the case of forgery and uttering of bills, &c., for which no less sentence than two years could be imposed. It would be interesting to know how many forgers have served sentences of less than two years for their offences. It was by no means unusual to hear certain judges tell the prisoners that the lowest punishment allowed for this offence was two years' imprisonment, but if at the end of 12 months their conduct in gaol appeared to be satisfactory, a remission would be recommended; in some cases the period has been reduced to six months, and in others to three. The enactment has thus been rendered little better than a sham. Experience has already shown that the same course is pursued with respect to minimum punishments under the Criminal Law Amendment Act; but even if the law were to be carried out strictly, there would still be a latitude so great that the inequality of sentences for crimes of the same magnitude would be practically untouched. For offences punishable with five years' penal servitude, which mean, in effect five years' imprisonment, no less sentence can be given than five, four, or three years respectively, except that in the two latter cases sentences of not less than three or two years' imprisonment respectively may be substituted for penal servitude, and for offences punishable with five years' penal servitude imprisonment for "not less than one year" may be substituted. Now, in looking over the category of offences liable under the Act to one, or other of the punishments above mentioned, it will be evident that there may be, in very many of them, mitigating circumstances which would render even the minimum punishment wholly disproportionate to the criminality or moral turpitude of the case. The Judge must nevertheless pass the sentence, but in doing so he often proclaims it a sham by stating that he will recommend a reduction to the Executive. This is not calculated to inspire respect towards our laws, but rather to exhibit them to the public as harsh and severe, imposing punishment which ought not to be carried out. But even this is not the worst: Juries are led to look upon themselves as protectors of the public against harsh laws. When to this is added the principle that a prisoner is always entitled to the benefit of doubt, and when both these levers are pulled by a powerful advocate for the defence, the probability of a correct verdict may be fairly estimated bearing in mind that one dissentient on the jury will secure the prisoner against conviction. Moreover, if a juror be satisfied that a prisoner's guilt is proved, but sees that the lowest punishment the law allows is greatly in excess of the merits of the case, he is sometimes sadly perplexed, and it may be feared that he too often has regard rather to what appears to him to be the interests of humanity than even to the solemn oath which he has taken, to give a true verdict according to the evidence. A double injury is thus done. Violence is done to the conscience of the persons who break the oaths, and the criminal, with others of his class, is led to hope that the law may, on other occasions also, be broken with impunity.

But how can such average sentences be fixed?

There are two ways: by express legislation,

fixing such average sentences, as well as the maximum sentence in each case, or by arrangement

among the judges, if they were empowered to meet (either the judges of the Supreme Court alone or the judges of all Courts holding places of judicature), and fix such average punishments by a majority. There would be in either case an authoritative guide which every honest judge would feel himself bound to defer to, and offenders would know that their sentences were not simply arbitrary, but determined by well-known and recognised rules, which all judges, endeavour to apply, alike, and in accordance with the same standard. If a judge, however, should, upon a particular occasion, fix a sentence which the majority of his colleagues would not consider appropriate, the majority would be bound to accept it.

If Mr. Justice B had been presiding, he would have given from three to five years. Now, there are far fewer mitigating than aggravating circumstances in the administration of public justice. So long as the magnitude of offences of

the same class or description varies so much as it does, it is necessary that the power of varying the punishment in proportion should be entrusted to the judges who try them. But it is not necessary that judges should be left without any other guide or limitation than their own inclination. In civil matters many things are left in the discretion of the Judge, but this has never been supposed to mean that the Judge "decides" them arbitrarily according to his inclination. Rules and principles are agreed upon among the judges, or established by precedent, from which no judge would feel at liberty to depart. Indeed, it has been laid down that legal discretion is the exercise of a sound judgment according to rules and principles of law. And if this be so in civil matters, is it not much more important that it should be so in criminal matters? It's thought intolerable that the decision of cases in equity should depend upon the conscience of a Chancellor, which may vary in different Chancellors just as the length of their feet varies, and equity lawyers have repudiated such a change as deteriorating to the character of the Court; but if this be so in respect of pounds, shillings, and pence, or the rights affecting a piece of land, is not the same principle more strongly applicable when the liberty of a man is at stake? The inequality of the sentences given by different judges was evidently considered by the framers of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, and a system of minimum punishments was arrived at as a remedy. It may well be doubted whether anything will be gained in the direction of equality of sentences by this system, while it is certain that there is much disadvantage attending it. The experiment of fixing a minimum punishment has been already tried, for many years in the case of forgery and uttering of bills, &c., for which no less sentence than two years could be imposed. It would be interesting to know how many forgers have served sentences of less than two years for their offences. It was by no means unusual to hear certain judges tell the prisoners that the lowest punishment allowed for this offence was two years' imprisonment, but if at the end of 12 months their conduct in gaol appeared to be satisfactory, a remission would be recommended; in some cases the period has been reduced to six months, and in others to three. The enactment has thus been rendered little better than a sham. Experience has already shown that the same course is pursued with respect to minimum punishments under the Criminal Law Amendment Act; but even if the law were to be carried out strictly, there would still be a latitude so great that the inequality of sentences for crimes of the same magnitude would be practically untouched. For offences punishable with five years' penal servitude, which mean, in effect five years' imprisonment, no less sentence can be given than five, four, or three years respectively, except that in the two latter cases sentences of not less than three or two years' imprisonment respectively may be substituted for penal servitude, and for offences punishable with five years' penal servitude imprisonment for "not less than one year" may be substituted. Now, in looking over the category of offences liable under the Act to one, or other of the punishments above mentioned, it will be evident that there may be, in very many of them, mitigating circumstances which would render even the minimum punishment wholly disproportionate to the criminality or moral turpitude of the case. The Judge must nevertheless pass the sentence, but in doing so he often proclaims it a sham by stating that he will recommend a reduction to the Executive. This is not calculated to inspire respect towards our laws, but rather to exhibit them to the public as harsh and severe, imposing punishment which ought not to be carried out. But even this is not the worst: Juries are led to look upon themselves as protectors of the public against harsh laws. When to this is added the principle that a prisoner is always entitled to the benefit of doubt, and when both these levers are pulled by a powerful advocate for the defence, the probability of a correct verdict may be fairly estimated bearing in mind that one dissentient on the jury will secure the prisoner against conviction. Moreover, if a juror be satisfied that a prisoner's guilt is proved, but sees that the lowest punishment the law allows is greatly in excess of the merits of the case, he is sometimes sadly perplexed, and it may be feared that he too often has regard rather to what appears to him to be the interests of humanity than even to

Intimations.

A. S. WATSON & CO.

FAMILY AND DISPENSING CHEMISTS,
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DRUGGISTS,
DRUGGISTS' SURDRENARY,
PERFUMERS,
IMPORTERS AND EXPORTERS
OF
MANILA CIGARS,
WINE AND SPIRIT MERCHANTS,
AND
MANUFACTURERS
OF
AERATED WATER.
THE HONGKONG DISPENSARY,
ESTABLISHED A.D. 1841.
THE SHANGHAI PHARMACY,
24, NANKIN ROAD, SHANGHAI.
BOTICARIALES,
14, ESCOLTA, MANILA.
THE CANTON DISPENSARY, CANTON.
THE DISPENSARY, FOOCHOW.

The Hongkong Telegraph

HONGKONG, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1883.

The puzzling phraseology of the political telegram received here from London on the 5th inst. has caused considerable amount of discussion amongst those who are interested in the Tonquin question and have closely followed the course of events connected with this veritable *bête noire*. According to the enterprising telegraphist, "The Russian, French and United States governments have promised to co-operate with the governments of Great Britain and Germany for the protection of neutrals in Germany." The previous day we had been informed that "The German Government had promised its co-operation with England for the protection of their subjects in China in case of war being declared." Reading the two telegrams together, their meaning to the ordinary reader would be simply, that, in the probable event of war being declared between France and China, the whole of the Powers named agree to combine for the protection of the foreign residents at the Chinese ports. This is a fair and reasonable rendering of these two telegraphic despatches, but in the face of previous messages, and under all the circumstances, it may be doubted whether that is actually what was meant to be conveyed; and even if it should be so, the question naturally arises—Where was the necessity for specially telegraphing what we all knew quite well before? Should war unfortunately take place—and only by something very little short of a miracle can it be avoided—it goes for the saying that the foreigners resident at several of the Chinese ports will be placed in positions of considerable difficulty and danger, and it is equally certain that the whole of the European Powers represented would co-operate for the protection of foreigners against the Chinese rabble. There can be no doubt whatever that the Chinese Government will use every possible means to protect the interests of neutrals at the Coast Ports.

It has been suggested, and not unreasonably suggested, we think, that the above quoted telegrams have special reference to the position said to have been taken up by Great Britain in the face of the threatened blockade of the Chinese ports by the French fleet. But then, France appears as one of the nations which have promised to co-operate with Great Britain and Germany, and it is this fact which has induced the opinion in many quarters that these so-called political telegrams are meaningless nonsense. However, next in importance to the actual question of war or no war between France and China, is this alleged decision of Great Britain to proceed to extreme measures if her commercial interests in China are imperilled by the threatened blockade of the ports. As has already been pointed out, not only in our column but by the press in all parts of the world, whatever may be the ultimate results for China and France, a war would be disastrous to the commercial interests of other nations, and would probably endanger the lives of many foreigners now residing in China as traders or as missionaries. The Chinese authorities are notoriously incapable of controlling the lawless rabble in exciting times, and it is, therefore, not in any way exaggerating the probabilities of the situation to predict that wherever the Europeans are not strong enough to protect themselves, or have not the protection of men-of-war, riot, robbery and bloodshed will ensue if any attempt is made by the French to blockade the Chinese coast. In the first place, the lives of foreigners residing in China must not be recklessly thrown away, and in the second place, the general commercial interests of foreigners must not be wantonly sacrificed. If our information may be relied on, the British Government

has taken up a most decided position. A month ago it had become plainly evident to Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet that the Franco-Chinese dispute had reached the verge of open war, and consequently the most explicit and positive instructions were issued to all the departments of the Government, having for their aim the proper and thorough conservation of British interests threatened. The Lords of the Admiralty were directed to strongly reinforce the British fleet in Chinese waters, and it was currently reported and believed that Admiral Willoughby had received orders to instruct the naval commanders under him to resist any attempt made by the French fleet to blockade Chinese ports where British interests actually existed. So far these reports have not been contradicted, and nothing has yet transpired to allow of their being confirmed.

It is, however, as a San Francisco contemporary very pertinently points out, not at all certain that France would desire, or be able, to blockade all the treaty ports. China has a formidable navy, and it might be used with effect against the French if they should divide their force by scattering their vessels so much as would have to be done to maintain an efficient blockade of all the principal ports. To prevent trade in articles that are contraband of war would be the principal, or only object France could have in establishing a blockade, and a natural desire to avoid complications with other Powers would suggest the desirability of securing this end with as little interruption of legitimate commerce as is possible. China draws her supplies of war material from abroad, and though she has been importing large quantities of arms and ammunition for months past, a long war would cause her to be severely crippled in every avenue by which she can secure further supplies, should she be shut off.

We quite agree with the suggestion that, in view of the peculiar interests of all commercial countries in the Chinese trade, and also in consequence of the imminent danger-to-foreign-lives-and-property-in-China, the present situation might well form the subject of an International Conference, in which there might be evolved a plan by which the interests of all parties would be secured. If France should agree that no blockade would be undertaken and nothing else done to interfere with the course of trade, Great Britain, Germany, the United States and other nations, could well afford to promise to use extra vigilance in preventing the exportation of war material or its transportation in their ships. These Powers have already agreed to perfect concert of action in protecting the lives and property of neutrals, and if all the squadrons on the Chinese coast will act together in this undertaking, they ought to be able to make lives and property secure at almost every point. If France can see her way clear to settling her dispute with China in Tonquin, it is improbable that any European Power will attempt to interfere; but the moment a blockade of the Chinese ports is established, the commercial interests not only of Great Britain but of Germany and other nations will be assailed, and a general war might be the result. That such a calamity will be averted, we hope and believe, as France is hardly likely to venture beyond her international rights whilst Great Britain is not sufficiently unreasonable and unjust to provoke a quarrel by arbitrarily insisting on concessions to which she has no valid claim.

TELEGRAMS.

LONDON, December 11th.
FRANCE AND CHINA.

The French Chamber of Deputies has passed a vote of confidence in the Ministry by a large majority. M. Ferry stated that it was impossible to suspend the advance on Bacninh in the absence of a definite basis of agreement.

THE POET LAUREATE CREATED A PEER.

Mr. Tennyson has been created a Baron.

LOCAL AND GENERAL.

A PARISIAN shoemaker advertises his ability to give expression to the foot.

THE British man-of-war *Sophia* left Chelmsford on the 1st inst. for Nagasaki.

We understand that the French corvette *Volta* is under orders to proceed to Canton.

A REGULAR Lodge of Perseverance will be held in Freemason's Hall, Zetland Street, on Monday evening next, the 17th instant, at 8.30 for 9 o'clock precisely.

The New Orleans *Pelicans* man has been travelling abroad, and says: "Italy has her glorious sunsets left, and that is about all. Her art treasures are all old-fashioned and out of style."

ALFRED SAUZAY and William Dyer, English shipwrights, were fined \$2 each, or 7 days, by Mr. Wodehouse this morning, for assaulting Li Kam, a shopman living in Queen's Road Central, and smashing one of his traps. The fines were paid.

MR. H. E. SIDFORD will take charge of the Customs at Shanghai during the temporary absence of Mr. Geo. B. Glover.

A CHINKiang correspondent writes to the *Shanghai Mercury*, under date of 6th inst., as follows:

"—The China Merchants' steamer *Yungching* arrived here last night and has gone alongside the Company's bulk to take in rice, munitions of war, &c. The tropes, I hear, will embark tomorrow; she therefore will not go up to Kwai-chow.

SAYS THE *Shanghai Mercury*:—At the mouth of Hongkew Creek is a native gunboat which is being fitted to sail by steam; the boiler and engine are in position, and the propeller is to be shipped in a few days. The house in her after-part is built of wood, after the foreign style, and there is a wheelhouse just before the boiler. She belongs to the Tao-tai of Chinkiang, and in it is said, to be used against French intruders!

SAYS THE *Shanghai Courier*:—A paragraph ap-

pears in the Chinese newspapers directing attention to Korean officials and merchants now resident in different parts of China, and it is reported that the Magistrate of the Mixed Court has been requested to send a special rupiah to every Korean in the place, and that only those Koreans who possess a certificate from their own authorities will be allowed to remain here.

SIX seven-pounder muzzle loading mountain guns, specially forwarded from home for our local Volunteer Artillery, were sent up to headquarters yesterday afternoon. These guns weigh 205 lbs. each, which, with a carriage weighing 124 lbs., brings up the total weight to 330 lbs. They are admirable pieces for ordnance, and should prove most suitable for the requirements of the Volunteers. We understand they were sent out free of charge by the home government.

TO PROVE that France once deserved the reputation of being a polite nation, *La Liberté* reminds us that in days gone by the Due de Collois, although very ill, insisted upon seeing the Spanish Ambassador, who had called upon him, to his carriage. The Ambassador wished the Duke to remain, where he was, and, to cut short a friendly alteration, left the room and locked the door behind him. De Collois, fearing lest French politeness should be beaten by Castilian courtesy, jumped out of the window, and was standing half in hand at the carriage door when his visitor left the house. "You might have killed yourself," M. de Collois, "said the Spaniard.

"No matter," replied the Duke, "what was necessary was to perform my duty."

THE *Shanghai Mercury* has evidently a very poor opinion of Mr. Colquhoun, late special correspondent for the *Times* in Tonquin. This is how the oracle of our northern contemporary sums up the author of "Across China":—The excellent article about France, China and Tongking which we extracted from the *Times*, was not written by Mr. A. R. Colquhoun, who arrived in Hongkong in August; the writer of the article was on his way home at Marseilles on August 4th. The author of the book "Across China" is obviously incapable of writing an article with so much good sense in it, as we could see by the unreadable letters he wrote to the *Times* on the subject. The *Quarterly* rather severely criticised Mr. Colquhoun's book in the article we referred to the other day.

LORD COLE RIDGE told the New Yorkers, in his farewell address, that he owed whatever degree of success in life he had attained to the constant study of Latin and Greek. This recalls Lord Brougham's remark that he owed all his success as an orator to his study of Demosthenes, and that even before an audience of illiterate countrymen he succeeded best when translating almost literally from the Athenian. Great men sometimes make mistakes about the origin of their own powers. Other people could see but little resemblance between the speeches of the rugged and strong-minded Brougham and those of Demosthenes, and it is perhaps possible that Coleridge would not have been a hewer of wood or a drawer of water had he never enjoyed the benefit of a classical education.

IT IS WELL known, says the *Alta California*, that the number of American merchants in China is now much less than it was twenty years ago, but from late statistics it appears that the decrease is still going on, with a prospect that Americans will be entirely excluded from the business. In 1860, according to the report of the foreign customs inspectors, there were at the treaty ports 515 Americans, representing thirty-one firms, while in 1882 there were but 16 residents and twenty-four firms. The English have 282 firms and the Germans 56. Of the foreign tonnage in the Chinese trade, not including that with Hongkong, 61.47 per cent was English, and 0.9 per cent American. The latter figures must be regarded with great pride by the advocates of our present system of "protecting" American commerce and industry.

THE *Shanghai evening papers* are still on the war-path, and lose no opportunity of giving each other "fins." The *Courier* had the last morning a row and here is the result published under the heading "A Literary Row":—The following paragraph appears in last night's *Mercury*. It bears entire evidence of having been written by the manager of the *Mercury*, who is also publisher of the religious weekly, and the expression of opinion is rather amusing:

"The *Lotus* troupe gave a performance in the Theatre Royal, City Hall, last evening, before a large and appreciative audience. The pieces produced were the 'Cup of Tea' under the title of 'Scroogins' Adventure,' and 'Bunratty' and Sullivan's comic opera 'The Contrabandista.' The comedian was rattled through in capital style, Mr. C. J. Barber being exceedingly funny in his delineation of the blighted belle Scroogins, while Miss Florence Coniffe and Messrs. O'Brien and Oakland were eminently satisfactory in the roles of Lady Clot, Sir Charles, and 'Tophy Popham' respectively. The 'Contrabandista' was excellently mounted and exceedingly well dressed, Mr. M. M. especially being made up and dressed to the life. Pressure on our space prevents us giving our usual extended notice of the performance of the opera, but we cannot help noting that the brunt of the work fell on Mr. D'Angelis, who, as the peripatetic photographic artist, kept the house in roar of laughter. The other principal parts were filled by Messrs. M. Williams, Barber, and Oakland, and Mesdames Victoria, Lotus, and Minnie. Nordin, who all worked hard towards making the performance go down well, with only a qualified amount of success. There are some very charming sins in the 'Contrabandista' but we fail to confess that Burnside's words do not run so well with Sullivan's music as the gems of W. S. Gilbert. We hardly think the 'Contrabandista' will stand repeating. The Lotus troupe will appear in Friday evening next at La Mascotte, when we doubt not a large and fashionable audience will assemble to witness the performance of Audrain's sparkling comic opera, on which occasion the company will be assisted by several of our most distinguished amateurs."

A PARIS court has just decided that a fire insurance company is liable for the loss of property through spontaneous combustion, even though no fire be apparent.

WE HAVE RECEIVED from Mr. C. Ford, the honorary

secretary, a copy of the schedule for the 12th annual flower show of the Hongkong Horticultural Exhibition Society. The exhibition will be held on Thursday and Friday the 14th and 15th of next February.

WE LEARN that the United States corvette *Essex*, Captain McCormick, will proceed to relieve the *Jintala* at Canton on Friday evening or Saturday morning next. The *Jintala* will, if all is quiet at Canton, return to Hongkong, where she will remain for a few days before proceeding to the north.

WE BEG to acknowledge receipt from the local agents, Messrs. Gibb, Livingston & Co., of the office calendar issued by the Imperial Fire Insurance Company. The calendar is unique in design, and is fitted with circular slides for changing the day and date of the week and the month, which arrangement renders it remarkably handy for office use.

WE LEARN that the annual bazaar in aid of the Chinese orphans under the care of the French sisters will be held in the City Hall, under the patronage of His Excellency the Governor and Lady Bowen, on Saturday, the 22nd instant, at 2 p.m. The band of the French flagship *Victoriaville* will be in attendance.

THE NEW Regatta course was marked off yester-

day morning by Inspector Cameron, a nautical

mile being the distance instead of a statute mile

as previously, thus cutting off one-fourth.

This and the alteration in the position of the finishing post, which has been moved considerably further north, should enable the distance to be covered in much less time than formerly, as rowers will

have the advantage of much better water,

especially at the finish.

THE CRY is, "still they come." Messrs. Hesse & Co., the local agents of the Scottish Union and National Insurance Company, have for-

warded us the almanac, date block and office calendar issued by the above named company.

The office calendar is one of the handsomest

we have ever seen, being quite a work of art.

In the centre of the calendar is a beautifully

colored sketch of Loch Achray and Pass of the

Trossachs, which makes it quite a drawing-room ornament.

The Scottish Union and National

Company of Edinburgh and London evidently

spare no pains or money to thoroughly advertise

their business.

TRAINING operations at the race-course are

gradually becoming more interesting.

Mr. Mat-

dawson had Mr. Paul's long string of sub-

scription griffins out on Monday morning and "pow'd" the whole of them—a couple of lame

ducks excepted about seven furlongs.

They are really a good looking lot of ponies, and

the majority of them galloped in good style.

To our

fancy the pick of the mob is Mr. Mody's chestnut,

a powerfully built customer and a fine mover,

and next to him we like Mr. Paul's black, Mr.

Mody's spotted, and Mr. Theod's dark-grey.

There was a good, turn-out at the enclosure this morning, but very little fast work was done.

Mr. Gordon's three white subcriptions, galloped slowly half a mile separately, the best of the

three, an exceedingly racing-like pony, un-

fortunately returning to the paddock lame in his

off fore leg. Mr. Tasman's grey, covered

half a mile in something like 56 seconds,

the mafo riding the pony's head off instead of galloping him steadily, as ordered.

In a half mile he turned round and abused him.

He then took him by the coat, led him up stairs, and when he got

there, gave him a kick in the right side.

Mr. Williams stated that on the evening of the

race, at 6 p.m., he called to the complainant to light

the fire in the parlour.

He did not come, and so he went down to him.

Complainant was just sitting down to his supper, and said he would not come until he had finished his meal.

He told him to light the fire at once, when he turned

round and abused him.

He then took him by the coat,

led him up stairs, and when he got

there, gave him a kick in the right side.

He told him if he did not keep quiet, he would send for the police.

He then took him into the hall, and as he continued to be abusive, sent for a constable.

The moment the constable came,

complainant commenced tearing his face

and body.

The Hongkong Telegraph.

No. 584.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1883.

SIX DOLLARS
PER QUARTER.

Insurance.

THE Undersigned have been appointed AGENTS to the NEW YORK BOARD OF UNDERWRITERS.

ARNHOLD, KARBERG & CO.
Hongkong, 15th June, 1881.

RECORD OF AMERICAN and FOREIGN SHIPPING.

ARNHOLD, KARBERG & CO.,
Agents.
Hongkong, 15th June, 1881.

THE STRAITS INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.

THE Undersigned having been appointed AGENTS of the above Company are prepared to grant Policies on MARINE RISKS to all parts of the world at CURRENT RATES.

ARNHOLD, KARBERG & CO.
Hongkong, 3rd November, 1883. [827]

NOTICE.

THE MAN ON INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.

(CAPITAL SUBSCRIBED.....\$1,000,000.)

The above Company is prepared to accept MARINE RISKS at CURRENT RATES on Goods, &c. Policies granted to all Parts of the world payable at any of its Agencies.

WOO LIN YUEN,
Secretary.

HEAD OFFICE,
No. 2, QUEEN'S ROAD WEST.

Hongkong, 1st February, 1882. [106]

YANGTSZE INSURANCE ASSOCIATION.

CAPITAL Fully Paid-up.....\$1,420,000.00
PERMANENT RESERVE.....\$1,250,000.00
SPECIAL RESERVE FUND.....\$18,235.56

TOTAL CAPITAL and ACCUMULATIONS, 31st March, 1883.....\$1,968,235.56

DIRECTORS.

F. D. HITCH, Esq., Chairman.

C. LUCAS, Esq. W. M. MEYERINK, Esq.

A. J. M. INVERARITY, Esq. G. H. WHEELER, Esq.

HEAD OFFICE—SHANGHAI,
Messrs. RUSSELL & Co., Secretaries.

LONDON BRANCH,
Messrs. BARING BROTHERS & Co., Bankers.

RICHARD BLACKWELL, Esq., Agent,
68 and 69, Cornhill, E.C.

POLICIES granted on MARINE RISKS to all parts of the World.

Subject to a charge of 12 per cent for Interest on Shareholders' Capital, all the PROFITS of the UNDERWRITING BUSINESS are annually distributed among all Contributors of Business (whether Shareholders or not) in proportion to the premia paid by them.

RUSSELL & Co., Agents.

Hongkong, 25th May, 1883. [83]

GENERAL NOTICE.

THE ON-TAI INSURANCE COMPANY, (LIMITED).

CAPITAL TAELS 600,000, EQUAL \$33,333.33.
RESERVE FUND.....\$70,858.27.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

LEE SING, Esq. LEE YAT LAU, Esq.

LO YEE MOON, Esq. CHU CHIE NUNG, Esq.

MANAGER—HO AMEL.

MARINE RISKS on GOODS, &c., taken at CURRENT RATES to all parts of the world.

HEAD OFFICE, 8 & 9, PRAYA WEST.

Hongkong, 1st September, 1882. [670]

UNION INSURANCE SOCIETY OF CANTON, LIMITED.

NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS.

A SECOND and FINAL BONUS of Five per cent on Contributions and a DIVIDEND of EIGHTEEN DOLLARS and TWENTYNINE CENTS per SHARE for the year 1882, will be Payable on MONDAY, the 2nd instant.

Warrants may be had on application at the Office of the Society on and after that date.

By Order of the Board,

DOUGLAS JONES,

Acting Secretary.

Hongkong, 22nd October, 1882. [794]

For Sale.

FOR SALE.

G. H. MUMM & Co.'s CHAMPAGNE.

QUARTERS.....\$2.22 per Case.
PINTS.....\$1.11 per Case.

Apply to MELCHERS & Co.

Hongkong, 2nd March, 1883. [144]

J. AND R. TENNENT'S ALE AND PORTER.

DAVID CORSAIR & SONS, MERCHANT NAVY.

Navy Boiled CANVAS.

CROWN CANVAS.

ARNHOLD, KARBERG & CO.

Hongkong, 15th June, 1883. [144]

WILLIAM DOLAN, SAIL-MAKER & SHIP-CHANDLER.

22, PRAYA CENTRAL.

COTTON, DUCKS, HEMP CANVAS.

MANILA ROPE, AMERICAN OAKUM.

LIFE-JUOYS, CORK JACKETS, &c., &c.

Hongkong, 6th December, 1882. [144]

RODERICK DHL WHISKY.

A Fine Flavoured Blend, Equal to Bouquet and Style to the

FINEST FRENCH BRANDY.

Agents, Mr. H. K. H. T. TURNER.

22, QUEEN'S ROAD EAST.

Hongkong, 16th November, 1883. [144]

For Sale.

CHRISTMAS, 1883.

LANE, CRAWFORD & CO. have received, and have now on view, A LARGE ASSORTMENT OF CHRISTMAS DELICACIES, ARTICLES SUITABLE FOR PRESENTS, AND FANCY GOODS.

Comprising—

REAL TURTLE SOUP.

KIPPERED SALMON.

SARDINES A LA SARDINES.

SARDINES AU CITRON.

HERRINGS IN WHITE WINE.

MACKEREL IN WHITE WINE.

FRENCH TRUFFLES.

ASSORTED ENGLISH PATTIES.

PATE DE FOIE GRAS.

TRUFFLED CHICKENS IN JELLY.

FRENCH TINNED LARKS.

ASSORTED FRENCH PATES.

ASPARAGUS.

PETITS POIS.

CHAMPIGNONS.

PUDGING & SULTANA RAISINS.

PEEL FOR MINCEMEAT.

CHRISTMAS HAMS.

CHRISTMAS CAKES.

PLUM PUDDINGS.

RIPE STILTONS.

PORT DU SALUT CHEESE.

GRUÈVE CHEESE.

GORGONZOLA CHEESE.

DOUBLE GLÖSTER CHEESE.

FRENCH PLUMS.

CRYSTALLIZED FRUITS.

ELVA'S PLUMS.

MUSCATEL RAISINS.

BARCELONA & BRAZIL NUTS.

BEST FRENCH CONFETTIONERY.

BONBONS & DRAJES.

BONBONNIERS for XMAS. TREES.

FRENCH CHOCOLATES.

NEWEST CASOQUES & CRACKERS.

FRENCH & ENGLISH TOYS.

ELECTRIC TOYS.

FRENCH & ENGLISH DOLLS.

OUT-DOOR GAMES.

XMAS & NEW YEAR CARDS.

JEWEL CASES.

FANCY PIPES & CIGAR TUBES.

FITTED TRAVELLING BAGS.

WORK BAGS & BASKETS.

PERFUME CASES.

NEW EMBOSSED STATUARY.

AFTERNOON TEA-SERVICES.

TETE-A-TETE SETS.

CHINA FIGURES & VASES.

DUBLIN LAMPS IN NEWEST DESIGNS.

CHILDREN'S ANNUALS.

PRESERATION BOOKS.

CABINET & SCRAP ALBUMS.

MENU & GUEST CARDS.

OSLER'S ARTISTIC CHINA & GLASS-WARE.

FLOWER BRACKETS & BASKETS.

PRETTY TEA & COFFEE SETS.

FLOWER STANDS.

TABLE DECORATIONS, LATEST DESIGNS & SHADES.

A HANDSOME DRAWING ROOM FOUNTAIN.

NEW ELECTRO-PLATED WARE.

COFFEE & TEA SERVICES.

SALAD BOWLS & HELPERS.

EPERGNE.

FLOWER & FRUIT STANDS.

NEW CENTRE PIECES.

DESSERT SETS.

WACHTER'S ROYAL CHARTER CHAPAGNE.

DEUTZ & GELDERMANN'S GOLD LACK CHAPAGNE.

KRUG'S PRIVATE CUVEE CHAPAGNE.

LEMOINE'S VIN BRUT CHAPAGNE.

SPARKLING MOSELLE.

DRY SHERRIES.

CHOICE BORDEAUX WINES.

AFTER-DINNER PORT.

BURGUNDIES.

HOCKS.

LIQUEUR-BRANDIES & WHISKIES.

LIQUEURS.

&c., &c., &c.

LANE, CRAWFORD & CO.

Hongkong, 3rd December, 1883. [144]

FOR SALE.

NEW DESIGNS.

IN BRUSSELS, CARPETS WITH BORDER & RUGS to Match.

A large and choice assortment of AXMINSTER & SKIN HEARTH RUGS.

EIDER DOWN QUILTS and PILLOWS.

TRAVELLING RUGS, in great variety.

A large stock of BRASS and IRON BEDSTEADS.

Ebony and Walnut COAL VASES.

Single and Double PERAMBULATORS.